

# DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 100 600

RC 008 301

AUTHOR Rodriguez, Rodolfo, Comp.  
 TITLE A Preliminary Study of 5th Year ESEA Title VII Bilingual Bicultural Programs with High Concentrations of Mexican American Students.  
 INSTITUTION National Education Task Force de la Raza, Albuquerque, N. Mex.  
 SPONS AGENCY National Education Association, Washington, D.C.  
 PUB DATE [73]  
 NOTE 48p.  
 EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC-\$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE  
 DESCRIPTORS \*Bilingual Education; Community Involvement; \*Educational Programs; Enrollment; \*Federal Programs; Financial Support; \*Mexican Americans; Parent Participation; Student Teacher Ratio; \*Surveys  
 IDENTIFIERS \*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title VII; ESEA Title VII

## ABSTRACT

In preparation for the National Bilingual Institute which was held November 28-December 1, 1973, a mail survey of fifth year ESEA (Elementary and Secondary Education Act) Title VII Bilingual Education Projects was conducted. Its purpose was to obtain data relative to the progress of bilingual bicultural education programs since implementation of the original Title VII legislation in 1969. Since the institute was concerned with Bilingual Bicultural Education as it affects the Mexican American child, those projects with a heavy concentration of Mexican American students were selected. Fifty-eight projects were sent survey questionnaires; 30 responded. The questionnaire was divided into: Basic Program Information; Instructional Component; Impact of Program; and Parent and Community Involvement. Project directors were asked to make recommendations for: national legislation, state legislation, U.S. Office of Education, State Departments of Education, school boards, teacher training institutions, and Chicano communities and parents. Among the findings were: the pupil/teacher ratio varied noticeably from project to project; 87 percent indicated having a language maintenance program; and 50 percent reported having influenced the development of bilingual programs in adjacent districts. (NQ)

ED 10600

**Co-sponsored**

by

and

# The National Education Association

[1973]

**Compiled and Submitted**

by

**Rodolfo Rodríguez**  
**Administrative Intern**

## Co-Editors

**Elias R. Bernal**  
**Administrative Intern**

Dr. Henry J. Casso  
Exec. Director  
National Educ. Task Force de la Raza

The National Education Task Force de la Raza  
The College of Education  
The University of New Mexico  
Albuquerque, New Mexico

## PREFACE

This document is a preliminary study of the fifth year federally funded ESEA Title VII projects which have a high concentration of Mexican American students. The original objective of this study was to provide information for the planners, speakers, moderators and panelists of the National Bilingual Bicultural Institute, "A Relook at Tucson '66 and Beyond," held November 28 - December 1, 1973 in Albuquerque, New Mexico. It must be pointed out that, as the Institute was concerned with Bilingual Bicultural Education as it affects the Mexican American child, this was an underlying factor in the selection of these projects. Also, fifth year projects were chosen as it was felt that, since they were the first and earliest projects, much could be learned from their experience.

In reviewing the results of the study, however, it was decided that the importance of the information gained warranted its immediate dissemination in its present form to the project directors who responded to the survey. On the other hand, a small committee is presently working on computerizing the information obtained by this survey which will enable us to make an in-depth analysis of the data. This will become Report 4 of the Institute and will contain not only a computerized analysis of the respondent information, but will also contain conclusions, implications and recommendations based on this data.

This study provides first hand information as to what is currently taking place throughout the country. Although this information is based on projects with a high concentration of Mexican American students, it is our perception that it is indicative of what is transpiring in programs with 1-4 years' experience or where there are concentrations of other linguistically and culturally distinct children. This is a proposition which the Institute planners and the Task Force will be pursuing.

In view of the fact that there are any number of states which are passing legislation for Bilingual Bicultural Education Programs, the information contained in this study and the subsequent Report 4 will, as it did for us in the Institute, provide valuable directions for program planning.

Some of the significant points found in this study which need careful review are:

1. The funding range of projects ranges from \$80,000 to \$4,000,000.
2. There is a heavy concentration of Mexican American students in the responding projects (88% Mexican American, 8% Anglo and 3% Black).
3. The pupil/teacher ratio varies noticeably from one project to another.
4. In administration, 50% of the evaluators have functional use of Spanish, whereas the remaining 50% are monolingual English speakers. As will be shown in Institute Report 4, the Bilingual evaluators have a tendency to use criterion referenced tests, whereas the monolingual evaluators have a tendency to use standardized tests.

5. Of utmost significance, eighty seven percent (87%) indicated having a language maintenance program whereas only thirteen percent (13%) reported having a transitional program.\*
6. Regarding standardized tests, the most frequently used test was the Inter American Series, which the Bay Area Bilingual Education League has taken serious exception to.
7. In the area of support for Bilingual Education (p.14), greater emphasis needs to be placed on gaining support from members of boards of education, project school principals, teachers in non-bilingual classes, local teacher associations, local colleges of education or teacher training institutions, and the community at large.
8. There is an interesting distance between parents used as volunteers and their assistance in the writing of bilingual curriculum material.

Tremendous gratitude must be given to the project directors, busy administrators that they are, who dedicated so much time in providing the responses to the survey which made this study possible. Gratitude is also expressed to Rudy Rodriguez and Elias Bernal, Administrative Interns in the Task Force office. Both are doctoral students who labored long to make this study a reality.

\* In Institute Report 2, it was found that of the 220 respondents to an Institute participation survey consisting of participants from 25 states, 31.8% were teachers or professors, 20% administrators, 16.8% project or program coordinators, 11.5% students, 3.2% community representatives, and 1.8% paraprofessionals. 14.5% of the respondents identified themselves in the "other" category. 46% indicated they employed the Language Maintenance Program with regard to the Spanish-English language development whereas only 12.7% of the respondents indicated they employed the Transitional Program in language development.

Finally, it is our hope, in presenting this study, that it will provide some view as to what is taking place in Bilingual Bicultural Education, with the objective of helping educational leaders, students, parents and communities help improve what is currently going on toward quality education for the linguistically and culturally distinct child in America.

Dr. Henry J. Casso  
Executive Secretary  
National Education Task Force de la Raza  
University of New Mexico  
Albuquerque, New Mexico, 87131

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	iii
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
 Chapter	
I. BASIC PROGRAM INFORMATION . . . . .	3
II. INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENT . . . . .	6
III. IMPACT OF PROGRAM . . . . .	11
IV. PARENT AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT . . . . .	16
V. PROJECT DIRECTORS' RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	18
APPENDIXES . . . . .	22
A. SURVEY OF ESEA TITLE VII BILINGUAL BICULTURAL PROGRAMS . . . . .	22
B. ESEA TITLE VII PROJECTS RECEIVING SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .	32
C. ESEA TITLE VII PROJECTS RESPONDING TO NATIONAL BILINGUAL BICULTURAL INSTITUTE SURVEY, . . . . .	37

# LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. ESEA TITLE VII BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROJECTS SURVEYED BY STATES . . . . .	1
2. ESEA TITLE VII FUNDING RANGE OF PROJECTS RESPONDING TO SURVEY . . . . .	3
3. SCHOOLS/CLASSES/PUPILS IN ESEA TITLE VII PROJECTS REPORTED BY LEVELS . . . . .	4
4. NUMBER OF ESEA TITLE VII PROJECT PERSONNEL BY JOB POSITION . . . . .	5
5. BILINGUAL EDUCATION INSTRUCTIONAL MODELS . . . . .	7
6. MAJOR BILINGUAL SUBJECT AREAS AND DEGREE OF PUPIL SUCCESS BASED ON JUDGMENT OF PROJECT DIRECTORS . . . . .	8
7. COMPOSITE PERCENTAGE FIGURES SHOWING THE LOCAL DISTRICT'S (LEA) SUPPORT FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION . . . . .	12
8. CHIEF SOURCE OF FUNDING FOR BILINGUAL PROJECT SCHOOLS OPERATING OUTSIDE ESEA TITLE VII . . . . .	12
9. BILINGUAL PROJECT SCHOOLS OPERATING OUTSIDE ESEA TITLE VII, BY LEVEL AND CLASSES . . . . .	13
10. GENERAL ATTITUDE OF KEY TARGET GROUPS TOWARD THE SUPPORT OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION . . . . .	14
11. PARENT INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES WHICH WERE TYPICAL OF THE PROJECTS REPORTING . . . . .	16
12. PROJECT DIRECTORS' RESPONSE TO ESEA TITLE VII ADVISORY COUNCILS . . . . .	17



## INTRODUCTION

In preparation for the National Bilingual Bicultural Institute which was held November 28 - December 1, 1973, in Albuquerque, New Mexico, a mail survey of fifth year ESEA Title VII Bilingual Education Projects was conducted by the Institute Planning Committee (see Appendix A). The intent of this inquiry was to secure data relative to the progress of bilingual bicultural education programs since the implementation of the original ESEA Title VII legislation in 1969.

Fifty-eight (58) projects were identified and sent survey questionnaires (see Appendix B). Of this number, thirty (30) responded (see Appendix C). Table 1 indicates the projects responding to the survey representing a 51% return.

TABLE 1  
ESEA TITLE VII BILINGUAL EDUCATION  
PROJECTS SURVEYED BY STATES

State	No. of Projects Receiving Survey	No. of Projects Responding
Arizona	4	3
California	26	9
Colorado	1	1
New Mexico	5	5
Texas	18	10
Illinois	1	0

TABLE 1 (continued)

State	No. of Projects Receiving Survey	No. of Projects Responding
Michigan	1	0
Wisconsin	1	1
Florida	1	1
Totals	58	30

0010

## I

## BASIC PROGRAM INFORMATION

The largest number of bilingual projects in their fifth year of operation fall in the \$80,000 - \$160,000 funding range. Other sources of funds being used by bilingual programs to supplement ESEA Title VII monies are local, state, ESEA Title I and ESEA funds. The largest portion of supplementary support was from local district funds. Forty percent (40%) of the projects indicated using ESEA Title I funds in the bilingual program.

TABLE 2

ESEA TITLE VII FUNDING RANGE OF  
PROJECTS RESPONDING TO SURVEY\*

Funding Range	No. of Projects
Under \$80,000	6
\$ 80,000 - \$160,000	8
\$161,000 - \$240,000	4
\$241,000 - \$320,000	1
\$321,000 - \$400,000	1
Over \$400,000	1

\*Nine (9) of the respondents failed to show their current level of funding.

THE TOTAL STUDENT ENROLLMENT COVERED BY THE SURVEY WAS 23,306. THIS COMPOSITE FIGURE REPRESENTS THE FOLLOWING ETHNIC BREAKDOWN. 88% MEXICAN AMERICAN, 8% ANGLO, AND 3% BLACK. ONE PERCENT (1%) OF THE STUDENT PARTICIPANTS WERE COMPRISED CHIEFLY OF PUEERTO RICANS, ORIENTALS, AND NATIVE AMERICANS.

TABLE 3  
SCHOOLS/CLASSES/PUPILS IN ESEA TITLE VII  
PROJECTS REPORTED BY LEVELS

Grade Levels	No. of Schools	Percent	No. of Classes	No. of Pupils	Percent	Pupil/Teacher Ratio
Prekindergarten	15	8	35	687	3	1-19
Kindergarten	55	28	108	2,720	2	1-25
Elementary	112	55	641	17,649	75	1-28
Junior High School	11	6	43	1,097	5	1-25
High School <sup>a</sup>	5	2	102	1,028	4	1-10
Parochial <sup>b</sup>	4	1	3	125	1	1-42
Totals	202	100	932	23,306	100	

<sup>a</sup>Respondents did not indicate reason for low pupil/teacher ratio.

<sup>b</sup>Two (2) respondents did not show number of classes and pupils.

The number of bilingual personnel was satisfactory for each position listed, except the evaluator's position where only fifty percent (50%) were reported as being functional in Spanish. Also, the inclusion

of parents of project children in teacher aide positions was relatively small in comparison to the large number of teacher aide slots available in the projects reporting.

TABLE 4  
NUMBER OF ESEA TITLE VII PROJECT  
PERSONNEL BY JOB POSITION

Job Titles	No. of Personnel	No. Having Functional Use of Spanish <sup>a</sup>
Administrators	30	27
Evaluators	28	14
Supervisors	55	53
Teachers	827	655
Teacher Aides	530	528
Teacher Aides (parents of project children)	90	90
Others <sup>b</sup>	107	107
Totals	1,647	1,474

<sup>a</sup>It is assumed that these personnel were equally functional in English.

<sup>b</sup>These positions were listed as community liaison personnel, social workers, teacher corps interns (or the like), media specialists, Spanish language specialists, home school aides, curriculum writers, office help, etc.

## II

## INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENT

WITH REGARD TO THE GENERAL ORGANIZATIONAL DESIGN OF THE BILINGUAL BICULTURAL PROGRAMS RESPONDING TO THE SURVEY, EIGHTY-SEVEN PERCENT (87%) INDICATED HAVING A LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE PROGRAM WHEREAS ONLY THIRTEEN PERCENT (13%) REPORTED HAVING A TRANSITIONAL PROGRAM. LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE PROGRAMS WERE DEFINED IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE AS PROGRAMS DESIGNED TO DEVELOP AND EXPAND THE TWO LANGUAGES (ENGLISH AND SPANISH) AND RELATED CULTURES THROUGHOUT THE COURSE OF THE PROGRAM. TRANSITIONAL PROGRAMS WERE DEFINED AS PROJECTS USING SPANISH IN THE INSTRUCTION FOR THE SPANISH-SPEAKING CHILD SOLELY AS A BRIDGE TO LEARNING ENGLISH.

The fact that most respondents indicated having language maintenance programs was most interesting considering that several national organizations are pushing the Massachusetts bilingual bicultural model which is transitional in nature. It is further understood that the present legislation in the Congress is "hung up" over efforts to push the transitional model rather than the language maintenance program.

Instructional models (or class techniques) most common among the ESEA Title VII projects responding were team teaching, individualized instruction, and the self-contained classroom. Table 5 also shows that the majority of the respondents felt that these models were operating at a level of success listed as "good." It was not unusual for respondents to show two or three grades, for example, using different

models in each grade. As might be expected, the self-contained classroom was especially popular in the preschool and primary grades (1-3).

TABLE 5  
BILINGUAL EDUCATION INSTRUCTIONAL MODELS\*

Education Model	Percentage of Degree of Success			
	High	Good	Moderate	Low
Team Teaching (N=17)	24	44	17	15
Open Space (N=7)	28	43	29	0
Individualized Instruction (N=17)	24	61	15	0
Programmed Instruction (N=4)	25	50	25	0
Non-gradedness (N=5)	0	60	20	20
Self-contained Class (N=18)	27	61	12	0

\*The questionnaire did not request respondents to describe the instructional models pertaining to their respective projects.

WHEN ASKED HOW IS SPANISH/ENGLISH INSTRUCTION PROVIDED IN BILINGUAL CLASSES HAVING MONOLINGUAL TEACHERS, FIFTY-FOUR PERCENT (54%) OF THE RESPONDENTS INDICATED BILINGUAL AIDES PROVIDE FOR THE SPANISH LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION; FORTY TWO PERCENT (42%) INDICATED BILINGUAL TEACHERS WORK

COOPERATIVELY WITH MONOLINGUAL TEACHERS. FOUR PERCENT (4%) OF THE RESPONDENTS REPORTED HAVING A COMPLETE STAFF OF BILINGUAL TEACHERS.

Evaluation instruments used by respondents to determine degree of pupil success in the subject areas listed in Table 6 were varied. The majority, forty-three percent (43%), indicated using only standardized tests in assessing pupil academic performance. Seventeen percent (17%) of the respondents reported using only locally-developed tests with THE MAJORITY OF THESE PROJECTS RELYING ON CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTING. Twenty-three percent (23%) of the projects used a combination of locally-developed and standardized tests.

TABLE 6

MAJOR BILINGUAL SUBJECT AREAS AND DEGREE  
OF PUPIL SUCCESS BASED ON JUDGMENT  
OF PROJECT DIRECTORS\*

Subject Area	Percentage of Degree of Success			
	High	Good	Moderate	Low
Spanish Reading	19	62	16	3
English Reading	12	60	28	0
English as a Second Language	25	58	17	0
Spanish as a Second Language	4	61	35	0
Mathematics	21	50	26	3
Science	0	70	30	0
Social Studies	18	68	14	0



TABLE 6 (continued)

Subject Area	Percentage of Degree of Success			
	High	Good	Moderate	Low
Bicultural Development (development of affective domain)	24	64	12	0
Pre-school English Language Developments	30	63	7	0

\*Degree of pupil success in each of the above subject areas listed was requested for the total project rather than individual grade levels.

The following were standardized tests most commonly reported in the survey. This list is in accordance to order of preference.

Inter American Series  
Metropolitan Readiness Test  
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test  
California Achievement and Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills  
Stanford Achievement Test

In regard to standardized tests, it is important to note the action of BABEL (Bay Area Bilingual Education League, June, 1972-Bilingual Testing and Assessment Proceedings of BABEL Workshop).

1. Whereas currently used standardized tests do not measure the potential and ability of California Bilingual or Bicultural children, and whereas these tests are being used as if they do so measure, and they are relied upon to the counsel, place and track these children, this body hereby resolves that such use of standardized tests should be immediately discontinued.

2. Sufficient evidence now exists to direct us to the development of Criterion Referenced Assessment systems as a means of improving educational programs accountability for learning activities. It is imperative that these evaluation processes be correlated with local performance objectives.

A PARTICULARLY SIGNIFICANT OBSERVATION WAS THE TENDENCY TOWARD  
THE USE OF CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS IN PROJECTS HAVING BILINGUAL  
EVALUATORS.

## -III

## IMPACT OF PROGRAM

IT IS SIGNIFICANT TO NOTE THAT LESS THAN HALF, THIRTY-SIX PERCENT (36%), OF THE FIFTH YEAR BILINGUAL PROJECTS HAVE A STATEMENT OF POLICY APPROVED BY THEIR RESPECTIVE BOARDS OF EDUCATION. THIS MEANS THAT SIXTY-FOUR PERCENT (64%) OF THE PROJECTS DO NOT HAVE A DEFINITE WRITTEN POSITION ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION APPROVED BY THEIR DISTRICTS. IMPORTANT ADVANTAGES OF THIS ACTION ON THE PART OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION ARE:

1. A STATEMENT OF POSITION HELPS GIVE BILINGUAL EDUCATION STATUS AND CREDITABILITY.
2. A STATEMENT OF POSITION STRENGTHENS ADMINISTRATIVE AND COMMUNITY SUPPORT FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION.
3. THIS TYPE OF BOARD ACTION HELPS TO GIVE A DEFINITE PURPOSE AND DIRECTION TO THE BILINGUAL PROGRAM; THEREFORE INCREASING CONFIDENCE IN THE PERSONNEL DIRECTLY INVOLVED IN THE PROJECT.

DESPITE THE ABOVE, THERE ARE STRONG INDICATIONS THAT DISTRICTS ARE TAKING ADVANTAGE OF FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL FUNDS TO EXPAND THE SCOPE OF THE BILINGUAL PROGRAM. WHEN ASKED "DO YOU HAVE A BILINGUAL PROGRAM NOW IN OPERATION NOT FUNDED BY TITLE VII?" SEVENTY PERCENT (70%) OF THE RESPONDENTS ANSWERED IN THE AFFIRMATIVE. TABLE 8 SHOWS PERTINENT DATA RELATIVE TO NON-TITLE VII SUPPORTED BILINGUAL PROGRAMS.

TABLE 7

COMPOSITE PERCENTAGE FIGURES SHOWING THE  
LOCAL DISTRICT'S (LEA) SUPPORT FOR  
BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Action of LEAs	Percent of Respondents
A statement of position on bilingual education has been written and passed by the Board of Education	36
The LEA has approved the use of local funds to expand the bilingual program.	40
The LEA has committed the use of local funds to continue the bilingual program beyond federal funding.	46
The LEA has adopted some of the successful bilingual materials and methods in non-bilingual schools.	53
The LEA is making an earnest effort to fill all teaching positions in the bilingual program with bilingual teachers.	80

TABLE 8

CHIEF SOURCE OF FUNDING FOR BILINGUAL PROJECT  
SCHOOLS OPERATING OUTSIDE ESEA TITLE VII

Funding Source	Percentage of Projects
Local	32
State	32
ESEA Title I	16
ESAA	20

The total student enrollment for the bilingual projects funded from the above sources was 16,644. The ethnicity of these students was: 86% Mexican American, 9% Anglo, 4% Black, and 1% Other.

A total of 221 schools were served by these bilingual programs. Table 9 shows the breakdown of these schools by levels.

TABLE 9

BILINGUAL PROJECT SCHOOLS OPERATING OUTSIDE  
ESEA TITLE VII, BY LEVEL AND CLASSES

Grade/Level	No. of Schools	Percentage
Prekindergarten	6	3
Kindergarten	88	40
Elementary	118	53
Junior High	3	1
High School	6	3
Parochial	0	0
Totals	221	100

It is interesting to note in Table 10 that two groups in particular were reported as having a significant moderate-to-low attitude toward bilingual education. This was indicated by teachers in non-bilingual classes and local teacher associations.

Table 10 also reflects a need to work with federal and state legislators so that they can be influenced in developing a more positive

attitude toward bilingual education as their decisions are key to the future of bilingual education.

TABLE 10  
GENERAL ATTITUDE OF KEY TARGET GROUPS TOWARD  
THE SUPPORT OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Target Groups	Percentage				Lack Basis for Comment
	High	Good	Moderate	Low	
Board of Education	26	36	33	3	0
School Administration	30	53	10	7	0
Project School Principals	46	30	20	4	0
Project Staff (Including teachers)	67	33	0	0	0
Teachers in non-bilingual classes	0	20	46	24	10
Parents of Project Pupils	77	17	6	0	0
Pupils in Bilingual Program	61	33	6	0	0
Project Para-Professional Personnel	69	31	0	0	0
Local Teacher Association	15	31	27	12	15
Local College of Education or Teacher Training Institutions	19	51	24	3	3
Community-at-Large	26	48	20	3	3
Local Area-State Legislative Delegation	18	36	14	0	32
Local Area-National Congressional Delegation	16	36	8	8	32

APPROXIMATELY FIFTY PERCENT (50%) OF THE RESPONDENTS REPORTED HAVING INFLUENCED THE DEVELOPMENT OF BILINGUAL PROGRAMS IN ADJACENT DISTRICTS AS WELL AS THE DEVELOPMENT OF BILINGUAL TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMS IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES LOCATED IN PROXIMITY TO THE BILINGUAL PROJECTS.

## IV

## PARENT AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Seventy-one percent (71%) of the respondents indicated having funds in their budgets specifically earmarked for parent involvement activities, e.g., community agents, visiting teachers, supplies for community activities, etc. Sixty-two percent (62%) reported publishing a program newsletter for parents.

TABLE 11

PARENT INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES WHICH WERE  
TYPICAL OF THE PROJECTS REPORTING

Parent Activity	Percentage of Projects Reporting Activity
Work as volunteer aides in the bilingual schools.	73
Help promote cultural development in the bilingual schools, e.g., by telling stories of Mexican American folklore and history.	83
Participate in advisory councils in each of the project schools.	83
Assist in the writing of bilingual curriculum materials.	20
Others (see below).	6

Other parent involvement activities included:

1. Parents assisting in education programs which consisted of "toy lending libraries" and "educational games lending kits."



2. One reported using a "Home Task Scheme" at the prekindergarten and kindergarten level.

3. "Parent and community people visit classrooms as role models . . . ."

4. Some projects reported involving parents in cultural and heritage days such as "Navidad" and "Cinco de Mayo."

IT IS SIGNIFICANT TO NOTE THAT 54% OF THE ADVISORY COUNCILS WERE INFLUENTIAL IN THE DECISIONS WHICH AFFECTED THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF BILINGUAL PROGRAMS. FURTHERMORE, 57% OF THE ADVISORY COUNCILS WERE MEETING ON A REGULAR MONTHLY BASIS WHILE 36% WERE MEETING LESS FREQUENTLY.

TABLE 12

PROJECT DIRECTORS' RESPONSE TO  
ESEA TITLE VII ADVISORY COUNCILS

Items Describing Bilingual Advisory Councils	Percentage of Respondents
The advisory council is composed chiefly of parents of project students.	80
The members of the advisory council are selected by the bilingual program staff.	27
The members of the council are selected by project parents.	43
The advisory council is functioning in accordance with guidelines which council members have prepared.	40

## V

## PROJECT DIRECTORS' RECOMMENDATIONS

National Legislation

1. Respondents generally felt the need for the federal government to continue funding of ESEA Title VII bilingual projects beyond the expiration period of federal support. For example:

Continued support and funding of programs where needed and extension of time on five year programs where justifiable.

Drop 5 year funding stipulation.

2. Furthermore, the project directors recommended that the federal government strengthen its position on bilingual education.

National and state legislation is needed which would make it mandatory for local districts to offer bilingual education in areas where there is a large concentration of children whose first language is other than English . . . .

The bilingual bicultural education movement must receive impetus starting with national legislation right on down. This impetus would encourage state level interest followed by action of local school boards.

State Legislation

Respondents indicated the need for legislators to strengthen their support of bilingual programs. For example:

State legislation helps give bilingual education status and credibility.

States must stop appropriating token sums if quality performances of bilingual programs is expected.

Continued support of programs and increase in appropriation to extend programs where needed--especially in grades 1 thru 6.

Every effort must be put forth to instruct our legislators that we want this program because it affords the best education our youth has received in the history of education in this country.

#### U.S. Office of Education

The following were typical recommendations directed at the U.S. Office of Education by the bilingual project directors:

that exemplary bilingual education programs which are completing their fifth year of federal funding be permitted to apply for additional funds in order to extend the program into new grades.

that exemplary bilingual education programs be selected and processes developed by which the model programs will be available for visitation by personnel from other school districts.

USOE recognize that bilingual education is for everyone.

In analyzing other parts of the survey, it was apparent that the majority of the projects were not supplementing ESEA Title VII funds with other available federal funds such as ESAA and ESEA Title I.

#### State Departments of Education

Project directors expressed the need to increase the number of state-level bilingual program supportive personnel.

The State Department of Education should have sufficient personnel to assist local programs in all matters pertaining to bilingual education.

State Education Agencies should provide more consultant services to school districts.

#### School Boards

1. Respondents indicated that school board members needed to become better informed about bilingual education. Typical comments were:

School boards need orientation and information.

School boards need to be informed of the advantages bilingual education offers all children.

Local schools should encourage their school board members to visit bilingual programs so that they will have a better idea of what bilingual education is.

2. It was further indicated that there exists a lack of interest and support for bilingual programs by local school boards. For example:

School boards should support and encourage bilingual education in communities . . . .

Boards must become sensitized to the needs of the entire student population.

Boards need to recognize the importance of Bilingual Advisory Councils and its influence in improving education.

Responses to other items within the survey questionnaire showed that the majority of the districts with ESEA Title VII programs did not have a policy of position on bilingual education.

#### Teacher Training Institutions

Recommendations in the area of teacher training dealt mainly with the need to develop and/or improve teacher training programs designed for teachers in bilingual education programs. For example:

Efforts are being made and should be continued to increase offerings of use to teachers already in bilingual programs . . . .

Move to provide the quality teacher training desperately needed . . . .

That funds be made available to teacher training institutions to enable them to cooperatively develop bilingual bicultural teacher training programs for undergraduate, graduate, as well as in-service and summer teacher training institutes.

Chicano Communities

Respondents indicated that Chicano parents should be encouraged to become more involved in the education of their children.

Parents in Chicano communities should be advised about bilingual programs and should be encouraged to visit such programs . . . .

Parents need to become politically involved in their schools and government. They must speak out for sound educational programs and take an even firmer stand on their success or failure.

APPENDIX A



# APPENDIX A NATIONAL EDUCATION TASK FORCE DE LA RAZA

The University of New Mexico - College of Education  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131 - Phone 277-5649 - 277-5640  
October 31, 1973

## NATIONAL CHAIRMAN

Dr. Rupert Trujillo  
Assistant Dean  
College of Education  
University of New Mexico  
Albuquerque, N.M. 87131

## EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

Dr. Henry J. Casso  
Associate Professor  
College of Education  
University of New Mexico  
Albuquerque, N.M. 87131

## REGIONAL CHAIRMEN

Manuel Andrade  
Assistant Director  
Elementary Education  
414 14th St.  
Denver Public Schools  
Denver, Colorado 70202

Dr. Jose Cardenas  
Executive Director  
Texans for Educational  
Excellence  
214 Dwyer St. Suite 309  
San Antonio, Texas 78204

Dr. Salomon Flores  
Director  
Programs for the Spanish  
Speaking  
Chicago State University  
9500 At King Drive  
Chicago, Ill. 60628

Dr. Robert Segura  
Assistant Professor  
School of Education  
Sacramento State University  
6000 J. St.  
Sacramento, Calif. 95819

TO: Selected Bilingual Bicultural ESEA Title VII Programs with a high percentage of Mexican American students

FROM: Dr. Henry J. Casso, Mr. Rudy Rodríguez, Mr. Tomás Villarreal  
National Bilingual Bicultural Institute Survey Committee

SUBJECT: Survey of ESEA Title VII Bilingual Bicultural Programs.

The National Education Task Force De La Raza and the National Education Association is sponsoring a National Bilingual Bicultural Institute with the theme, "A Relook at Tucson '66 and Beyond." The Institute will be held Nov. 28 - Dec. 1, 1973, at the Western Skies Motor Hotel in Albuquerque, New Mexico (tentative program schedule is enclosed).

Our National Bilingual Bicultural Institute is designed to influence the direction of national and state legislation as well as policies of state school boards and departments of education. In addition, it is hoped that this influence will extend to teacher associations, teacher training institutions, and local school boards.

The enclosed questionnaire has been developed to secure information crucial to the future of bilingual education in this country. The data collected from this Survey will serve as the basis for a composite report which will be distributed not only to the participants of the above-mentioned Institute, but likewise to key national and state decision-makers who have an influence on Bilingual Bicultural education.

As you may know, the U.S. Office of Education is holding hearings on the ESEA Title VII regulations for the coming year. Hearings on the Kennedy, Montoya, and Cranston new bilingual legislation are also being held in the U.S. Senate.

Through your collaboration we can ensure a brighter future for bilingual education by increasing legislative and educational interest and support.

This inquiry is not intended to be an evaluation of individual projects. Therefore, we would appreciate your being as candid as possible in your responses.

Your assistance is requested in completing this survey and returning it to our office by November 13, 1973. We realize that this is an additional demand on your time and energy; however, it is our feeling that the future of many of our children is dependent on you.

Project directors responding to our survey are assured a copy of this report.

Enclosures

0031

SURVEY OF ESEA TITLE VII PROGRAMS  
IN PREPARATION FOR THE  
NATIONAL BILINGUAL BICULTURAL INSTITUTE

Section I. Basic Program Information

✓ (1) School District Reporting:

a. Name of District \_\_\_\_\_

b. Address \_\_\_\_\_ c. Bilingual Office Phone No. \_\_\_\_\_

d. Project Director \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

(2) ESEA Title VII Program Information:

a. Title of Project \_\_\_\_\_

b. Current ESEA Title VII Fund level (Grant) \_\_\_\_\_

Other sources of funding coordinated with ESEA Title VII. (Check sources which apply)

\_\_\_\_\_ 1. Local \_\_\_\_\_ 3. State \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Other (Specify)  
\_\_\_\_\_ 2. Title I \_\_\_\_\_ 4. ESAA

✓ c. Funding Period \_\_\_\_\_ d. Circle all grade levels involved in your Title VII program:

Pre-K K 1 2 3 4 5  
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 Adult Ed.

✓ e. Give number of schools participating in your Title VII bilingual program for each level indicated:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Pre-K K Elementary Jr. High High School Parochial

Give number of classes participating in your bilingual program for each level indicated

\_\_\_\_\_  
Pre-K K Elementary Jr. High High School Parochial

Give student enrollment in your bilingual program for each level indicated below:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Pre-K K Elementary Jr. High High School Parochial

(3) Program staff/pupil data:

a. Total ESEA Title VII Program student enrollment \_\_\_\_\_

b. Ethnic breakdown of project students \_\_\_\_\_  
Mexican American Anglo Black Other (Specify)





b. Check the statement below which best describes the intent of your bilingual program with regard to Spanish/English language development.

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. The instructional program is designed to develop and expand the two languages and related cultures throughout the course of the program.  
(Language maintenance program)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Spanish is used in the instructional program for the Spanish-speaking child as a "bridge" to learning English. Once the child has achieved an adequate command of English, Spanish is dropped from his instructional program.  
(Transitional program)

(2) Check the models listed below which apply to the organization of your instructional program.

	Grade or Level	Degree of Success			
		High	Good	Moderate	Low
Team Teaching					
Open Space					
Individualized Instruction					
Programmed Instruction					
Non-gradedness					
Self-contained class					
Others (list)					

(3) How is Spanish/English instruction provided in bilingual classes having monolingual teachers? (Check items which apply)

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. Bilingual aides provide for the Spanish language instruction.
- \_\_\_\_\_ b. Bilingual teachers work cooperatively with monolingual teachers.
- \_\_\_\_\_ c. Other staffing patterns. (explain)

COMMENTS:

### Section III. Impact of Program

- (1) Check items which relate to local district (LEA) support for the bilingual program. (Check all items which apply)

- ☐ a. A statement of position on bilingual education has been written and passed by the Board of Education.
- ☐ b. The LEA has approved the use of local funds to expand the bilingual program.
- ☐ c. The LEA has committed the use of local funds to continue the bilingual program beyond federal funding.
- ☐ d. The LEA has adopted some of the successful bilingual materials and methods in non-bilingual schools.
- ☐ e. The LEA is making an earnest effort to fill all teaching positions in the bilingual program with bilingual teachers.

       b. The LEA has approved the use of local funds to expand the bilingual program.

c. The LEA has committed the use of local funds to continue the bilingual program beyond federal funding.

\_\_\_\_\_ d. The LEA has adopted some of the successful bilingual materials and methods in non-bilingual schools.

\_\_\_\_\_ e. The LEA is making an earnest effort to fill all teaching positions in the bilingual program with bilingual teachers.

**COMMENTS:**

- (2) Do you have a bilingual program now in operation not funded by Title VII?  
Yes No

- a. If yes at what grade levels \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Date program began \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Total student enrollment \_\_\_\_\_ Ethnic breakdown \_\_\_\_\_
- | Mexican<br>American | Anglo | Black | Other<br>(Specify) |
|---------------------|-------|-------|--------------------|
|---------------------|-------|-------|--------------------|
- d. Source of funds:
- |                  |                |                          |
|------------------|----------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Title I _____ | 2. Local _____ | 5. Other (Specify) _____ |
| 3. ESAA _____    | 4. State _____ |                          |
- e. Give the number of bilingual program schools now in operation not funded by Title VII for each level indicated:

b. Date program began \_\_\_\_\_

c. Total student enrollment	Ethnic breakdown			
	Mexican American	Anglo	Black	Other (Spec)

<u>Mexican</u>	<u>Anglo</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Other</u>
American			(Spec)

d. Source of funds:                    1. Title I \_\_\_\_\_                    2. Local \_\_\_\_\_                    5. Other (Specify)  
   3. ESAA \_\_\_\_\_                    4. State \_\_\_\_\_

e. Give the number of bilingual program schools now in operation not funded by Title VII for each level indicated:

Pre-K	K	Elementary	Junior High	High School	Parochial
-------	---	------------	-------------	-------------	-----------

- (3) Indicate the general attitude of each of the following target groups toward supporting your bilingual program.

	High	Good	Moderate	Low	Lack Basis for Comment
Board of Education					
School Administration					
Project School Principals					
Project Staff (Including teachers)					
Teachers in non-bilingual classes					
Parents of Project pupils					
Pupils in bilingual program					
Project Para-Professional Personnel					
Local Teacher Association					
Local College of Education or Teacher Training Institutions					
Community-at-Large					
Local Area-State Legislative Delegation					
Local Area-National Congressional Delegation					

- (4) To what extent has your program influenced adjacent districts having Spanish-speaking students to develop bilingual programs? (Using the following rating scale, circle appropriate number.)

Greatly                      Not  
Influential                      Influential  
1      2      3      4      5

- (5) To what extent has your bilingual program influenced area colleges and universities to modify their teacher training curriculum to accommodate the special needs of teachers in bilingual education? (Using the following rating scale, circle the appropriate number.)

Greatly                      Not  
Influential                      Influential  
1      2      3      4      5

COMMENTS:

0036

- \_\_\_ a. Parents work as volunteer aides in the bilingual program.
- \_\_\_ b. Parents help promote cultural development in the bilingual schools.  
(e.g. by telling stories of Mexican American folklore and history)
- \_\_\_ c. Parents participate in advisory councils in each of the project schools.
- \_\_\_ d. Parents assist in the writing of bilingual curriculum materials.
- \_\_\_ e. Others (Specify)

- ☐ a. The advisory council is composed chiefly of parents of project students.
- ☐ b. The members of the advisory council are selected by the bilingual program staff.
- ☐ c. The members of the advisory council are selected by project parents.
- ☐ d. The advisory council is functioning in accordance with guidelines which council members have prepared.
- ☐ e. To what extent does your advisory council influence decision-making as it relates to your program development and implementation? (Using the rating scale, circle the appropriate number.)

<b>Greatly</b>				<b>Not</b>	
<b>Influential</b>				<b>Influential</b>	
1	2	3	4	5	

- g. The advisory council meets: (Check one)**

- ☐ Two times during the school year.  
☐ Four times during the school year.  
☐ Each month during the school year.  
☐ Whenever the Council chairperson deems necessary.  
☐ Whenever the program director deems necessary.  
☐ Other (Specify)

Section V. Other Relevant Information

- (1) Please indicate degree of pupil success in each of the bilingual program subject areas listed below. Show this on the rating scale as an overall average for your project. Indicate evaluative instrument(s) used to assess subject area progress.

Subject Area	Degree of Success				Evaluative Instruments
	High	Good	Moderate	Low	
Spanish Reading					
English Reading					
English as a Second Language					
Spanish as a Second Language					
Mathematics					
Science					
Social Studies					
Bicultural Development (development of affective domain)					
Pre-school English Language developments					
Pre-school Spanish Language developments					

- (2) Please indicate your major concerns relative to the development of your bilingual education program.

0038

(3) List major recommendations based on your experience for any or all of the following:

1. National Legislation
2. State Legislation
3. National Institute of Education
4. U.S. Office of Education
5. School Boards
6. State Department of Education
7. Teacher Training Institutions
8. Chicano communities and parents

Please return complete questionnaire by November 13, 1973 to:

National Education Task Force De La Raza  
The University of New Mexico  
College of Education, Room 232  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131

0039

APPENDIX B



APPENDIX B  
ESEA TITLE VII PROJECTS RECEIVING  
SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Arizona

Mr. Servando B. Carrillo  
Bilingual Education  
2411 East Buckeye Road  
Phoenix, Arizona 85034

Ms. María Luisa Vega  
Bilingual Education  
512 East Van Buren  
Phoenix, Arizona 85006

Mr. Edward L. Madrid  
Bilingual Education  
1010 East 10th Street  
Tucson, Arizona 85717

Mr. Hamon Watson  
Bilingual Education  
402 Martinez Street  
Nogales, Arizona 85621

California

Dr. Harry C. Allison  
Bilingual Education  
2348 Mariposa Street  
Fresno, California 93721

Mr. Leo S. Cardona  
Bilingual Education  
1405 French Street  
Santa Anna, California 92701

Ms. Susan T. Flores  
4400 Cathedral Oaks Road  
Santa Barbara, California 93111

Mr. Leo Grijalva  
Bilingual Education  
11120 Broaded Street  
Santa Fe Springs, California 90670

Ms. Harriett Jowett  
Bilingual Education  
2314 Mariposa Street  
Fresno, California 93721

Mr. Joe Bravo, Jr.  
Bilingual Education  
P.O. Box 710  
Santa Paula, California 93060

Mrs. Juanita Cirilo  
Bilingual Education  
15959 East Gale Avenue  
La Puente, California 91744

Mr. Frank Goodman  
Bilingual Education  
Thomas Jefferson School  
2508 East 113rd Street  
Compton, California

Mrs. Georgebelle S. Jordan  
Bilingual Education  
551 South "H" Street  
Barstow, California 92311

Mr. Paul H. Juárez  
Bilingual Education  
1130 Fifth Avenue  
Chula Vista, California 92011

California (continued)

Ms. Victoria Kaplan  
Bilingual Education  
School and Henry Street  
Ukiah, California 95482

Mr. Joseph P. Licano  
Bilingual Education  
P.O. Box 218  
Gonzales, California 93926

Mr. Felipe E. Lozano  
Bilingual Education  
504 "J" Street, Del Monte Square  
Marysville, California 95901

Mrs. Toni Micotti  
Bilingual Education  
San Antonio School Module  
1855 East San Antonio Street  
San Jose, California 95110

Mr. Isaac R. Montanez  
Bilingual Education  
250 First Street  
Brentwood, California 94513

Mr. Richard G. Roche  
Bilingual Education  
965 Main Street  
St. Helena, California 94574

Mr. Hector Solís  
Bilingual Education  
202 County Civic Center  
Visalia, California 93277

Mr. Henry Vásquez  
Bilingual Education  
1801 7th Street  
Sanger, California 93657

Colorado

Ms. Lena Archuleta  
Office of Federal Projects  
2320 West 4th Avenue  
Denver, Colorado 80223

Mr. John S. Kately  
Bilingual Education  
304 Center Street  
Healdsburg, California 95448

Mr. Americo López-Rodríguez  
Bilingual Education  
California State University  
Fullerton  
Fullerton, California 92634

Mr. David L. Martínez  
Bilingual Education  
2930 21st Avenue  
Sacramento, California 95820

Mr. Harvey N. Miller  
Bilingual Education  
Box 792  
Calexico, California 92231

Mr. Ken Noonan  
Bilingual Education  
800 South Garey Avenue  
Pomona, California 91766

Mr. Robert Rodríguez  
Bilingual Education  
4020 North Gibson Road  
El Monte, California 91731

Mr. Ricardo Valenzuela  
Bilingual Education  
701 North Madison Street  
Stockton, California 95202

Mr. Kenneth G. Woody  
Bilingual Education  
815 Allerton Street  
Redwood City, California 94063

Florida

Mr. Fred Pezzulio  
 Bilingual Education  
 1001 Third Avenue North  
 Naples, Florida 33940

Illinois

Mr. Eduardo Cadavid  
 Bilingual Education  
 228 North LaSalle Street  
 Chicago, Illinois 60601

Michigan

Mr. José Frank Soriano  
 86 Park Hurst  
 Pontiac, Michigan 48058

New Mexico

Mr. Bill Gutiérrez  
 Bilingual Education  
 1106 West Quay Avenue  
 Artesia, New Mexico 88210

Mr. Arturo Méndez  
 Bilingual Education  
 P.O. Box 8  
 Grants, New Mexico 87020

Mr. J. Paul Taylor  
 Bilingual Education  
 K-3 Project, 1850 North Church  
 Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001

Texas

Ms. María Barrera  
 Bilingual Education  
 6404 Tracor Lane  
 Austin, Texas 78721

Mr. Louis F. Martínez  
 Bilingual Education  
 P.O. Box 249  
 Espanola, New Mexico 87532

Mr. Carlos Saavedra  
 Bilingual Education  
 P.O. Box 1927  
 Albuquerque, New Mexico 87103

Ms. Irene García  
 Bilingual Education  
 P.O. Box 120  
 La Joya, Texas 78560

Texas (continued)

Mr. Wendell Jones  
Bilingual Education  
Drawer E  
Abernathy, Texas 79311

Mr. Raúl Muñoz, Jr.  
Bilingual Education  
3202 Wesleyan Road, Suite 252  
Houston, Texas 77027

A. R. Ramírez  
Bilingual Education  
101 South Tenth Street  
Edinburg, Texas 78539

Mr. James Lehmann  
Bilingual Education  
3210 West Lancaster  
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

Mr. J. B. Peña  
Bilingual Education  
P.O. Box 1229  
Del Rio, Texas 78840

Mr. Ruben Rodríguez  
Bilingual Education  
P.O. Box 990  
101 North 8th  
Edinburg, Texas 78539

**APPENDIX C**

## APPENDIX C

ESEA TITLE VII PROJECTS RESPONDING TO NATIONAL  
BILINGUAL BICULTURAL INSTITUTE SURVEY

Arizona

Mr. Edward L. Madrid  
Bilingual Education  
Tucson, Arizona

Ms. María Luisa Vega  
Bilingual Education  
Phoenix, Arizona

California

Dr. H. C. Allison  
Bilingual Program  
Fresno Schools  
Fresno, California

Mr. Leo S. Cardona  
Bilingual Program  
Santa Anna Unified School District  
Santa Anna, California 92701

Ms. Susan T. Flores  
Bilingual Program  
Santa Barbara, California 93111

John S. Kately  
Bilingual Program  
Healdsburg Union Elementary  
St. Healdsburg, California

Dr. David L. Martínez  
Bilingual Program  
Sacramento City Unified School  
Sacramento, California 95820

Mrs. Toni Micotti  
Bilingual Program  
San Antonio School Module  
San Jose, California 95110

Mr. Harvey N. Miller  
Bilingual Program  
Calexico Unified School District  
Calexico, California

Ken A. Noonan  
Bilingual Program  
Pamona Unified Schools  
Pamona, California

R. Roche  
Bilingual Program  
St. Helena High School District  
St. Helena, California

Robert Rodríguez  
Bilingual Program  
El Monte Elementary School District  
El Monte, California

Colorado

Mrs. Lena Archuleta  
Bilingual Program  
Office of Federal Projects  
Denver, Colorado

Florida

Mr. Fred Pezzullo  
Bilingual Program  
1001 Third Avenue North  
Naples, Florida 33940

New Mexico

Bill Gutiérrez  
Bilingual Program  
Artesia, New Mexico 88210

Arturo Méndez  
Bilingual Program  
Grants Municipal Schools  
Grants, New Mexico

J. Paul Taylor  
Bilingual Program  
Las Cruces School District  
Las Cruces, New Mexico

Louis F. Martínez  
Bilingual Program  
Española Municipal Schools  
Española, New Mexico

Carlos Saavedra  
Bilingual Program  
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Texas

Maria Barrera  
Bilingual Program  
Education Service Center XIII  
Austin, Texas

Rene González  
Bilingual Program  
Southwest Texas State University  
San Marcos, Texas

Raúl Muñoz, Jr.  
Bilingual Program  
Houston ISD  
Houston, Texas

Alonso Perales  
Bilingual Program  
San Antonio, Texas

Gloria Gámez  
Bilingual Program  
Edgewood ISD  
San Antonio, Texas

James Lehmann  
Bilingual Program  
Fort Worth, Texas

J. B. Peña  
Bilingual Program  
San Felipe Del Rio  
Consolidated ISD  
Del Rio, Texas

A. R. Ramírez  
Bilingual Program  
ESC Region I  
Edinburg, Texas

Texas (continued)

Doris Rector  
Bilingual Program  
Lubbock, Texas

Joel Vela  
Bilingual Program  
San Angelo, Texas

Francisco Rodríguez  
Bilingual Program  
Zapata, Texas

Carolyn Wade  
Bilingual Program  
Abenathy, Texas

Wisconsin

Anthony Gradisnik  
Bilingual Program  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin